



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/557,440

11/18/2005

Peter Toth

U 016032-1

8489

140 7590 02/23/2011

LADAS & PARRY LLP

1040 Avenue of the Americas

NEW YORK, NY 10018-3738

EXAMINER

DANG, DUY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/23/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

nyuspatactions@ladas.com

nymail@ladas.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/557,440	Applicant(s) TOTH ET AL.	
	Examiner Duy M. Dang	Art Unit 2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on reply filed on 11/29/2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☒ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-60 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment and Arguments

1. Applicant's amendment filed on November 29, 2010 has been entered and made of record.
2. The rejection of claims 1-56 and 58-60 under 35 USC 101 has been withdrawn herein in view of Applicant's amendment and remarks (see page 23 of the reply filed on November 29, 2010).
3. The rejection of claims 57 under 35 USC 112(1) has been withdrawn herein in view of Applicant's amendment and remarks (see page 22 of the reply filed on November 29, 2010).
4. The objection to of claims 1, 8, 14, 23, 28, 35, 38, 44, 49 and 58 has been withdrawn herein in view of Applicant's amendment and remarks (see page 22 of the reply filed on November 29, 2010).
5. The objection to of claims 5-13, 18-22, 25-34, 38-43 and 51-60 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) has been withdrawn herein in view of Applicant's amendment and remarks (see page 22 of the reply filed on November 29, 2010).
6. This application is in condition for allowance except for the following informal and/or formal matters (37 CFR 1.75(a)):
 - (a) As to claim 1, please add a comma (“,”) to the end of step i; and the “(prediction)” (see step c and step ii) and “(DCT)” (see step ii) ought to be deleted.
 - (b) As to claim 4, the “(original)” (see line next to last line) ought to be deleted.
 - (c) As to claim 8, the “Claim 8 8” (see line 1) ought to be replaced by “Claim 8”.
 - (d) As to claim 14,

Art Unit: 2624

(i)the “(DC” (see step c) ought to be changed to “(DCT)”;

(ii)the “(matrices of DCT coefficients)” (see step c) ought to be deleted; and

(iii)the “(quantization)” (see step d) ought to be deleted.

(e)As to claim 16, the recitation of “the quantization” (see line 1) renders claim insufficient antecedent basis.

(f)As to claim 18, the recitation of “the table” (see line 2) renders claim insufficient antecedent basis.

(g)As to claim 20, the recitation of “the available storage capacity” (see lines 1-2) renders claim insufficient antecedent basis.

(h)As to claim 21, the “(prediction)” (see last line) ought to be deleted.

(j)As to claim 22, recitation appears to be redundant because some or all are previous recited in independent claim 1. Also the “(prediction)” (see step c and step ii) and “(DCT)” (step ii) ought to be deleted.

(i)As to claim 34, recitation appears to be redundant because some or all are previous recited in independent claim 23. Also the “(prediction)” (see step c and step ii) and “(DCT)” (step ii) ought to be deleted.

(k)As to claim 40, the “(“ and “)” (see last line) ought to be deleted.

(l)As to claim 43, recitation appears to be redundant because some or all are previous recited in independent claim 35. Also the “(prediction)” (see step c and step ii) and “(DCT)” (step ii) ought to be deleted.

(m)As to claim 44, the “(matrices of DCT coefficients)” (see step b) and “(quantization)” (see step c) ought to be deleted.

Art Unit: 2624

(n)As to claim 45, the recitation of “the neural network” (see line 1) and “the normalized values” (see line 4) render claim insufficient antecedent basis. Also the “(slot)” (see line 7) ought to be deleted.

(o)As to claim 49, this claim does not complaint with 37 CFR 1.121 (see MPEP 714(II)(C)) because it has an improper claim status identifier (original) instead of “currently amended”. Suggestion is made to change it to “previously presented” when response is filed. Furthermore, the recitation of “the normalized” (see line 1) renders claim insufficient antecedent basis.

(p)As to claim 50, the recitation of “the network” (see lines 1-2) renders claim insufficient antecedent basis.

(q)As to claim 51, the “in’the time” (see last line) ought to be changed to “in the time”.

(r)As to claim 52, the recitation of “the minimum” (see line 2) and “the network” (see line 3) render claim insufficient antecedent basis.

(s)As to claim 56, recitation appears to be redundant because some or all are previous recited in independent claim 44. Also the “(prediction)” (see step c and step ii) and “(DCT)” (step ii) ought to be deleted.

(t)As to claim 57, it is not clear what the pronoun “it” (see line 2) refers back to.

(u)Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the application as well as any errors not presented above.

7. Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Art Unit: 2624

8. A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire TWO MONTHS from the mailing date of this letter.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 1-60 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objection set forth above.

10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 1, the cited prior art does not appear to teach or suggest the claimed limitations as set forth in steps d-e. Likewise, claims 2-13 and 57-60 are allowable for the same reasons as above.

Regarding claim 14, the cited prior art does not appear to teach or suggest the claimed limitations as set forth in steps d-e. Likewise, claims 15-22 are allowable for the same reasons as above.

Regarding claim 23, the cited prior art does not appear to teach or suggest the claimed limitations as set forth in steps d-e. Likewise, claims 24-34 are allowable for the same reasons as above.

Regarding claim 35, the cited prior art does not appear to teach or suggest the claimed limitations as set forth in steps b-c. Likewise, claims 36-43 are allowable for the same reasons as above.

Regarding claim 44, the cited prior art does not appear to teach or suggest the claimed limitations as set forth in steps c-d. Likewise, claims 45-56 are allowable for the same reasons as above.

Art Unit: 2624

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duy M. Dang whose telephone number is 571-272-7389. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 6:00AM to 2:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew C. Bella can be reached on 571-272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dmd
2/2011

/Duy M Dang/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624